

Evtioushchine shows, in Fig. 3, dipole element 20 on both sides of radiation plate 10 (actually, upper dipole element 20 and lower dipole element 20) surrounded by parasitic elements 22, 24 that block dispersion of waves radiated from the lower dipole element.

Evtioushchine fails to show or suggest the claimed third element, and further fails to show or suggest the claimed matching network. Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by Evtioushchine.

Claims 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14 and 16, in depending from claim 1, incorporate all of its features and so each of these dependent claims is patentably distinguished from Evtioushchine for the reasons discussed above.

At page 3 of the Office Action, in the paragraph titled “Claim 16:”, the Examiner stated, “where Fig. 8 [of Evtioushchine] shows a flat gain curve shown exemplified by the flat VSWR”.

Applicant respectfully observes that Fig. 8 of Evtioushchine shows VSWR on its ordinate (y-axis), NOT gain. A gain curve is typically different than a VSWR curve, that is, a gain curve is *not* exemplified by a VSWR curve, as the Examiner stated.

Fig. 8 of Evtioushchine shows a flat VSWR over a range of about 600 – 1000 MHz. In contrast, as recited in claim 13 and shown in Fig. 4 of the present application, in one embodiment, the present invention has a VSWR of better than 2:1 over at least 600 – 2600 MHz.

Claim 17 is directed to a bow tie coupler with similar features as the coupler of claim 1. Since Evtioushchine fails to show or suggest the third element and matching network as specifically recited in claim 17, claim 17 is not anticipated by Evtioushchine.

Claim 21, in depending from claim 17, incorporate all of its features and so claim 21 is patentably distinguished from Evtioushchine for the reasons discussed above.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 5, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 21 as being anticipated by Evtioushchine is requested.

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-5, 8, 14, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,265,977 (Vega).

Vega shows, in Fig. 1, first and second antenna elements 112, 114 that are electrically isolated from each other (column 4, lines 13-15), with integrated circuit 116 therebetween. Since Vega teaches electrical isolation of its antenna elements, Vega teaches away from the invention as recited in each of claims 1 and 17 that includes a matching network for electrically connecting its antenna elements. Further, Vega teaches away from the third element as claimed in claims 1 and 17, since Vega has elected to place an integrated circuit between its antenna elements, precluding placement of the claimed third element between the first and second elements.

Accordingly, each of claims 1 and 17 is not anticipated by Vega.

Claims 2-5, 8, 17; and 18, in respectively depending from claims 1 and 17, each include the features of their parent claim, and so each of these dependent claims is not anticipated by Vega.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-5, 8, 14, 17 and 18 as being anticipated by Vega is requested.

On page 6 of the Office Action, claim 6 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Evtioushchine and U.S. Patent No. 5,914,695 (Liu).

Liu was cited for its disclosure of a third element having a square shape.

Figs. 1 and 2 of Liu show the top and bottom, respectively, of a substrate. Radiating elements 12a, 12b, 12c, 12d form a dipole (column 3, lines 25-27). Conducting patches 16, 17 couple the dipole antenna to matching network 18.

Liu's radiating elements lack a tapered portion with a nose, and so do not correspond to the claimed first and second elements. Since Liu lacks first and second elements with noses, Liu fails to show or suggest the claimed third element disposed between the noses of the first and second elements. Accordingly, Liu's matching network 18 does not correspond to the claimed matching network

Each of Evtiushkine and Liu fails to show or suggest the claimed matching network for electrically connecting the first, second and third elements, as specifically recited in claim 1 and incorporated in claim 6 due to its dependence from claim 1. Accordingly, claim 6 is not made obvious by any proper combination of Evtiushkine and Liu.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6 as being obvious over Evtiushkine and Liu is requested.

On page 7 of the Office Action, claims 15, 19, 22 and 24 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Evtiushkine and U.S. Patent No. 6,842,141 (Suh).

Suh was cited for its disclosure of an antenna in an anechoic chamber.

Each of Evtiushkine and Suh fails to show or suggest the claimed third element, and further fails to show or suggest the claimed matching network, as recited in claims 1 and 17, and incorporated in each of claims 15 and 19 by virtue of their respective dependence therefrom. Thus, each of claims 15 and 19 is not made obvious by any proper combination of Evtiushkine and Suh.

Claim 22 is directed to a coupler for use in a radio frequency test chamber having the features discussed above with regard to claims 1 and 17. Accordingly, claim 22 is patentably distinguished from the cited references for the reasons discussed above. Claim 24, in depending from claim 22, incorporates all of its features and similarly patentable over the cited references.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15, 19, 22 and 24 as obvious over Evtioushchine and Suh is requested.

On page 8 of the Office Action, claim 20 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Evtioushchine and U.S. Patent No. 5,293,175 (Hemmie).

Hemmie was cited for its disclosure of a signal feed structure being a coaxial cable.

Each of Evtioushchine and Hemmie fails to show or suggest the claimed third element, and further fails to show or suggest the claimed matching network, as recited in claim 17, and incorporated in claim 20 by virtue of its dependence therefrom. Thus, claim 20 is not made obvious by any proper combination of Evtioushchine and Hemmie.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 20 as obvious over Evtioushchine and Hemmie is requested.

On page 9 of the Office Action, claims 15, 19, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Vega and Suh.

Each of Vega and Suh fails to show or suggest the claimed third element, and further fails to show or suggest the claimed matching network, as recited in claims 1, 17 and 22, and incorporated in each of claims 15 and 19 and 23 by virtue of their respective dependence therefrom. Thus, each of claims 15, 19, 22 and 23 is not made obvious by any proper combination of Vega and Suh.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15, 19, 22 and 23 as obvious over Vega and Suh is requested.

A Notice of Allowance is solicited. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned to discuss any issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 8, 2005

Brenda Pomerance

Brenda Pomerance, Reg. No. 36,894

Law Office of Brenda Pomerance
260 West 52 St. Ste. 27B
New York, NY 10019
212 245-3940